



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/781,326	02/13/2001	Toyoaki Furusawa	1081.1109/JDH	9068

21171 7590 06/06/2006

STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

HARRELL, ROBERT B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Art Unit: 2142

1. Claims 1-14 remain for examination.
2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The claims are more directed to distributing contents in a child server closest to a current location of a requesting client as determined by a parent server.
3. The new specification filed 12 September 2005 contains typographical error such “theFig. 2” page (10 (line 4) [0034]), also see paragraph [0034] with respect to figure 4; there are many more and all require correction to be fully responsive to this Office Action.
4. The applicant should use this period for response to thoroughly and very closely proof read and review the whole of the application for correct correlation between reference numerals in the textual portion of the Specification (i.e., “theFig. 2” page (10 (line 4) [0034]), also see paragraph [0034] with respect to figure 4; there are many more) and Drawings along with any minor spelling errors, general typographical errors, accuracy, assurance of proper use for Trademarks <sup>TM</sup>, and other legal symbols ®, where required, and clarity of meaning in the Specification, Drawings, and specifically the claims (i.e., provide proper antecedent basis for “the” and “said” within each claim). Minor typographical errors could render a Patent unenforceable and so the applicant is strongly encouraged to aid in this endeavor.
5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this action:

**A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -**

**(e) the invention was described in — (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language;**

6. **Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e)** as being anticipated by Li (US 6,799,214 B1).

7. Prior to addressing the grounds of the rejections below, should this application ever be the subject of public review by third parties not so versed with the technology (i.e., access to IFW through Public PAIR (as found on <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>)), this Office action will usually refer an applicant's attention to relevant and helpful elements, figures, and/or

Art Unit: 2142

text upon which the Office action relies to support the position taken. Thus, the following citations are neither all-inclusive nor all-exclusive in nature *as the whole of the reference is cited* and relied upon in this action as part of the substantial evidence of record. Also, no temporal order was claimed for the acts and/or functions.

8. Li taught a distribution system (e.g., see Title) connected to clients (e.g., see Abstract) through communication circuit (e.g., see figures 1-3), comprising a parent server (e.g., see figure 2 (98)) and child servers (e.g., see figure 2 (22 and/or 100)), wherein the parent server comprised (a) a receiving unit (e.g., see figure 5 (38,42,72, and/or 74) receiving an area identification representing a current geographical position (e.g., see col. 2 (line 46 “geographically” and lines 53-58 [“get index.html”] will have the current IP address of the end user 92) and col. 13 (line 32 “geographical”))(e.g., also see figure 1 (“Japan”) and figure 5 (“IP address” of 130 as technically explained per col. 2 (lines 28-53))) of one of the clients (e.g., “end user” 128 of figure 5) and identification information of contents (e.g., “Web Pages” per figure 4 and figure 5 “Page request” of 130)), distribution of which is requested by the one of the clients (e.g., see figure 5 (130)), and (b) a selecting unit (e.g., see figure 5 (38, 72, 74, 76, 80 and/or 126)) selecting one of the child servers that holds the contents, distribution of which is requested, and which child server is closes to the one of the clients that originates the distribution request, using the received area identification and identification information (e.g., see Abstract), and notifying (e.g., see figure 5 (76)) the one of the clients that originates the distribution request of logical position information of the selected one of the child servers (e.g., see col. 9 (line 56-et seq.)); and each child server comprises a distribution unit distributing the contents, distribution of which is request by the one of the clients (e.g., see col. 10 (line 35-et seq.)).

9. Per claims 2, 3, and 4, such ascertaining, copying, and deleting was normal “cache” functions of the caching for the mirror sites as depicted in figure 5 and recited, for example, in col. 7 (line 58-et seq.) for copying the contents, and col. 10 (lines 35-40 (threshold equates to ascertaining frequency of distribution requests for Web Page contents)), and col. 12 (line 44 “frequently”-et seq.) and more so in col. 13 (line 32 “deleted”) for reasons more so then staleness. The usage “cache” terminology is noted within Li, and thus functionality (i.e., method of expiring data from cache or obtaining data), is therefore incorporated into this applied reference as anticipated by col. 9 (lines 33-46) and col. 12 (lines 20-53). It is noted that the claims recite an “or” condition (i.e., “presence or absence” also “or the frequency”); thus, only one limitation condition need be met, not all, by the applied reference (i.e., presence or absence or frequency) under 35 U.S.C. 102. Also, while given the hosting Web Servers and Mirror sites, nomenclature need not be restricted statically to each site, thus a Mirror Site was anticipated to be a parent site in a plural level tree structure or that the parent site be the Mirror Site since each computer was a Web Server in and of itself. More so, the copying of data in terms of pushing or pulling is relative in that a parent that pushes Web Pages to the child none the less has a child that copies the content and the like for pulling from the child off the parent with notification to the client being that of element 76 of figure 5 (located near center right of figure 5 just under “Cacheportal 38”). In other words, if the copying is initiated by the parent (i.e., a push) the child nonetheless partakes in the copying function/program and thus the child also copies the contents based on a program

Art Unit: 2142

download from the parent (i.e., HTML code and/or other code to program the child into this relationship be the program length of just one code line or command).

10. Per claims 5-14, these claims do not teach or defined above the correspondingly rejected claims given above, and are thus rejected for the same reasons given above. However, per claims 8, 9, and 10, software and hardware are equivalent and it was also anticipated that to function as taught the associated product was inherently required within Li's system. Along with claim 3, as indicated above, per claim 5, claim 6 and claim 7, see col. 12 (lines 43-53).

11. The above rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) was provided in examiner's prior Office Action which rejection and grounds for rejection are repeated and continue herein this non-final Office Action.

12. In rebutting the above rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), the applicant argued (24 March 2006) in substance that:

a) Li does not teach a selecting of which child server is closest to the one of the clients that originates the distribution request based on a current geographical position. That is, Li merely teaches that what is sent by a client is an IP address, and a position (for example, Japan) is determined using this IP address. However, Applicants submit this does not teach determining a current geographical position. ***However***, see col. 2 (line 46 "geographically" and lines 53-58 ["get index.html"]) will have the current IP address of the end user 92 and col. 13 (line 32 "geographical". Also see figure 1 ("Japan") and figure 5 ("IP address" of 130 as technically explained per col. 2 (lines 28-53)). That is, the current IP address indicates the current geographical location of the requesting user;

b) examiner, in effect, concedes that Li teaches a virtual "position" within the internet and not a current geographical locality. ***However***, while the Internet itself is a protocol established virtual network overlaid preexisting physical wires (i.e., phone companies), like phone numbers, so do IP addresses establish current locations as clearly taught by Li as cited above. Also the claims (i.e., claim 8, claim 11, claim 13, and others) implement logical positioning as provided in light of the specification (i.e., page 9 of the specification filed on 12 September 2005, or page 18 (line 21) of the original specification). In all cases, Li's "Japan" is not a "logical" location but rather a geographical location ascertainable from any globe;

c) Li does not teach acquiring and copying based on the frequency of distribution requests. ***However***, Li clearly acknowledged and taught mirroring contents based on frequency of request per col. 12 (lines 43-53)) and any teaching above such are all encompassed within this teaching and not negating such.

13. **A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days from the data of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (see MPEP 710.02, 710.02(b)).**

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert B. Harrell whose telephone number is (571) 272-3895. The

Art Unit: 2142

examiner can normally be reached Monday thru Friday from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm and on weekends from 6:00 am to 12 noon Eastern Standard Time.

15. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew T. Caldwell, can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for all papers is (703) 872-9306.

16. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.



ROBERT B. HARRELL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 2142